

## REMARKS

Claims 1-35, as amended, remain herein.

1. Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-35 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested..

2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 20, 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Pawlak U.S. Patent No. 5,883,557.

Pawlak discloses a permanent magnet mechanically linked to external contacts. See Pawlak Figs. 1-3, col. 2, lines 38-60, and col. 11, lines 1-51. But Pawlak does not disclose a magnetic element in direct proximity to a contact zone such that when a magnetizable element is magnetized, it exerts magnetic attraction or repulsion directly on the magnetic element in proximity to the contact zone.

Thus Pawlak does not disclose or suggest all elements of Applicant's claimed invention and therefore is not a proper basis for any rejection under §102. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Pawlak that would have suggested Applicant's claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of all claims 1,6,7,20 and 23 are respectfully requested.

3. Claim 8 was rejected under §103(a) over Pawlak.

But Pawlak does not disclose a magnetic element in direct proximity to a contact zone such that when a magnetizable element is magnetized, it exerts magnetic attraction or repulsion directly on a magnetic element in proximity to a contact zone.

There is no disclosure or teaching in Pawlak that would have suggested or made obvious Applicant's claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claim 8 are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, all claims 1-35 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection listed in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-35 is respectfully requested.

4. Applicants note and appreciate the statement in the Office Action that claims 2-5, 9-19, 21, 22, and 24-35 would be allowable if amended to overcome the §112, paragraph two, rejection and to include all limitations of their respective base and intervening claims. While the latter has not been done, Applicants believe that claim 1 as amended is now fully in condition for allowance, so that all dependent claims 2-35 which are directly or indirectly dependent upon amended claim 1 are likewise in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Applicant : Pierre Batfeux  
Serial No. : 10/532,969  
Filed : 04/27/2005  
Page : 13 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 28954.1431

Should the Examiner believe that any further change would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger W. Parkhurst  
Reg. No. 25,177

Date: March 3, 2006

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-1795  
Tel: (202) 429-6420